

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTOPHER YANCY,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 2:11-cr-20108-STA

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR SENTENCE REDUCTION

Before the Court is Defendant Christopher Yancy’s *pro se* Motion for Reduced Sentence Pursuant to the First Step Act of 2018 (ECF No. 90) filed on April 2, 2020.

The First Step Act authorizes courts to modify a term of imprisonment for “extraordinary and compelling reasons” that “warrant such a deduction.” 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i); *see also United States v. Conley*, No. 18-5582, 2019 WL 2403230, at *2 (6th Cir. Jan. 9, 2019) (describing the First Step Act’s compassionate release provision as an exception to the general rule that “a district court may not reduce a defendant’s sentence after imposing it”) (citing *United States v. Doe*, 731 F.3d 518, 522 (6th Cir. 2013)). Courts are permitted to act only on motion of (1) the Bureau of Prisons or (2) the defendant himself after the defendant has “fully exhausted all administrative rights to appeal a failure of the Bureau of Prisons to bring a motion on the defendant’s behalf or the lapse of 30 days from the receipt of such a request by the warden of the defendant’s facility, whichever is earlier.” 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i).

In this case, Defendant has not shown that he has exhausted all administrative remedies to avail himself of the First Step Act’s compassionate release provision. Therefore, Defendant’s

Motion is **DENIED** without prejudice to re-file the Motion once Defendant can show that he has exhausted his administrative remedies.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ S. Thomas Anderson
S. THOMAS ANDERSON
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Date: June 16, 2020.